(3) CF 2004

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2961 OF 2003

Single Bench
needs about-Ultras

PETITIONERS :

(1) Chandra Kumar Agrawal, S/o Bholaram Agrawal, R/o Village – Paterapali, Tah. – Saraipali, Distt. Mahasamund (C.G)

(2) Mohan Kenwat, S/o Dharmu Kenwat, R/o – Paterapali, Tah. – Saraipali, Distt. Mahasamund (C.G)

P. R. No. 2537/03
Presented by Shri Sanjeet Sharma
dated 19/06/03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

(1) The State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Forest Department, D. K.S. Bhawan Raipur(C.G.)

(2) Conservator of Forest, Raipur Circle, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

(3) D. F. O., Saraipali, Distt. Mahasamund (C.G.)

(4) Range Officer, Saraipali, Distt. Mahasamund (C.G.)

(5) Assistant Range Officer, Saraipali, Distt. Mahasamund (C.G.)

20/7/03

RECEIVED COPY,
29/8/03
CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION U/A 226/227 OF THE CONSITITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC—78

(66)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. NO. 2961 / सन् 2003

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	19.02.2004 Shri Awadh Tripathi, counsel for the petitioners. Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal, Dy. Advocate General for the State. With the consent of the parties, heard finally. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner No.1 is the owner of the Tractor and Trolley bearing Regn. No. M.P. 23 G 8046 and 8047 and the petitioner No. 2 is a Driver of the said vehicles, which have been confiscated. Counsel for the petitioners further submits that against the order of confiscation in connection with the said vehicles, the petitioners moved an appeal before the Conservator of Forest and the Conservator of Forest dismissed the appeal, against which the petitioner moved a criminal revision before the Sessions Court and engaged the counsel. It is submitted that the said revision has also been dismissed by impugned order dated 22.04.2003 (Annexure P/3) for non-appearance of the counsel. Counsel for the petitioner submits that it was for the counsel to appear but the counsel could not appear. Counsel ~~for the parties~~ further submits that because of non-appearance the parties should not suffer. - 2 -	

(67)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and material on record, ends of justice will be served if a direction is given that dismissal of the revision on failure of counsel to appear is set aside. Accordingly, the revision be restored to its original number and the Sessions Judge, ~~Raipur~~ to decide the same expeditiously in accordance with law. With the aforesaid direction, this petition stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. **Sd/-** **Fakhruddin** **Judge**	

Rao/vathi

CGPRT—FS/78 —9/2006—50,000.